



IFW

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Pietro ARMANINI et al.

Group Art Unit: 3653

Application No.: 10/501,241

Examiner: M. BEAUCHAINE

Filed: September 15, 2004

Docket No.: 120364

For: CURRENCY BILL RECYCLING MACHINE

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the February 13, 2006 Office Action, please consider the following:

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. In light of at least the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over European Patent Application Publication EP 0967581 to Katou et al. (hereafter

"Katou"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action alleges Katou discloses the elements of claim 1 as follows:

Claim 1

Input and output
Transport system
Detection system
Recycling store
Recirculation store
Unfit bill store

Katou

Deposit/withdrawal port 2
Transport path 501
Discriminating unit 3
Recycle box 8
Temporary storage box 4
Reject box 9

In Katou, the function of the discriminating unit 3 is explained in paragraph [0027]. There is included a two-sheet detecting portion which detects the displacement of the rollers at the time of bill transport to determine whether or not there is a superimposition of two sheets, one over the other. There is also a discriminating portion which detects the print of a bill to discriminate the kind of bill, or the truth or falsehood thereof. Katou is absolutely silent regarding any fitness determination as recited in claim 1. Thus, while the Office Action alleges the discriminating unit 3 reads on the claimed detection system, this is incorrect as it does not perform any fitness determination.

In Katou, the temporary storage box 4 receives all bills which have been successfully accepted by the bill discriminating unit 3 at the time of a deposit transaction (page 5, lines 24-25 and page 8, lines 10-12). Further, bills in the temporary storage box 4 are, as part of the overall transaction, subsequently delivered back to the discriminating unit 3 from which they are sorted into one of the boxes 6, 8 and 9 (page 8, lines 17-21). In contrast, Applicant's claimed recirculation store stores currency fit for recirculation but not fit for recycling by the machine. Thus, while the Office Action alleges that temporary storage box 4 reads on the recirculation store of claim 1, the temporary storage box 4 only temporarily stores bills subject to their subsequent movement within the machine whereas the recirculation store stores currency until removal for continued use.

Katou's reject box 9 is disclosed as a box for storing bills not destined for the deposit box 6, recycle box 8, or withdrawal box 7 - i.e., a box for storing bills not able to be affirmatively stored elsewhere. In contrast, Applicants' claimed unfit bill store is a box for storing only those bills determined as unfit for further circulation. Thus, while the Office Action alleges reject box 9 reads on the unit bill store, this is incorrect.

In view of at least the foregoing, Katou fails to disclose at least a detection system able to distinguish bills unfit for circulation, a recirculation store, and an unfit bill store.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Katou.

As claims 4-10 depend from claim 1, they are at least patentable over Katou for the same reasons claim 1 is patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Katou as applied to claim 1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,204 to Jones et al. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Katou as applied to claim 1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,625,870 to Nao et al. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Katou as applied to claim 1 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,587,408 to Watanabe.

These rejections are premised upon the presumption that Katou discloses all of the features of claim 1. Because, as discussed above, Katou fails to disclose all of the features of claim 1, the rejections of claims 2, 3, and 11 are improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/sxb

Date: April 20, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--